第８講　長文問題演習⑧

ポイント

❶ 文型倒置
❷ 強制倒置
❸ 対比の発見

次の英文を読み，下の問いに答えなさい。（* を付した語句には，問題文の末尾に注がある。）

Last June, the Supreme Court made same-sex marriage legal throughout the United States. The historic opinion, written by Justice* Anthony Kennedy, used language so beautiful that it quickly became popular in wedding ceremonies. In September, I attended three that quoted Kennedy's declaration that marriage "allows two people to find a life that could not be found alone, for a marriage becomes greater than just the two persons." Less often quoted, but perhaps more important, is the section of Kennedy's opinion which lists the "material burdens" placed on same-sex couples previously denied the right to marry: exclusion from the benefits* and rewards given to workers and their spouses* through retirement savings programs, health insurance, and tax policy, for example. "Marriage remains a building block of our national community," Kennedy explained. "Just as a couple vows to support each other, so does society pledge to support the couple, offering symbolic recognition and material benefits to protect and nourish the union."

NOTE

(1) At first glance, Kennedy’s claim that the material benefits offered to married couples by the government and employers are there to “nourish” each union seems like nothing more than an idealistic way of saying something obvious: Americans know that there are economic rewards to marriage. But Kennedy’s word choice was not random. Benefits designed to “nourish” do more than reward the act of getting married; (2) they encourage married couples to behave in certain ways. Since their introduction, America’s biggest social insurance programs have promoted inequality within marriages by pushing couples to organize their household economies so that one spouse is in the workforce* while the other performs unpaid care work* in the home.

Social Security*, for example, encourages breadwinner-homemaker* marriages using both (3) carrots and sticks. Most people understand Social Security to pay out benefits at retirement purely on the basis of what individuals pay into the system during their working lives. But, in fact, Social Security does not pay everyone who contributes the same amount equally. Being married or unmarried also determines the size of an individual’s benefit. Social Security’s retirement insurance program offers a married person an extra 50 percent of whatever retirement benefit he or she earns. This “dependent benefit*” is intended to support the worker’s spouse. Single people in the workforce pay the same Social Security taxes as married people, but they do not earn this dependent benefit. In other words, single people only earn two-thirds of what married people can earn.

NOTE

However, marriage isn't always such a good deal. Only certain married people gain from Social Security's benefit structure: married couples who generally fit the breadwinner-homemaker model. When spouses earn roughly equal amounts in the workforce, they lose. In a marriage where one spouse is employed and the other is not, the spouse who remains at home receives the dependent benefit — through his/her spouse — without paying anything into the system at all. When both spouses are in the workforce, the dependent benefit is still available, but only one spouse can claim it. To receive the dependent benefit, however, the "dependent" spouse has to give up any Social Security benefits she has earned through her own earnings record. If there is a large enough gap between spouses' earnings, this choice makes sense: 50 percent of the higher-earning husband's benefit will amount to more than the individual benefit earned by many women. But this decision still leaves women having paid money into the system that has no effect on the benefits they receive. Alternatively, if both spouses apply for their individual benefits, they give up the dependent benefit their marriage entitles them to. This is like a Social Security penalty for spouses who both work. Such spouses do not receive the full benefits to which they are entitled. To this day, (　A　), Social Security rewards marriages where one spouse stays home.

NOTE

Today, fewer and fewer families conform to the breadwinner-homemaker model that the social insurance system rewards. Since the 1930s, when the Social Security system was created, divorce rates have risen and marriage rates have fallen. Meanwhile, in 2014, one in five adults over twenty-five had never been married — in contrast to 1960, when it was roughly one in ten. And in 2012, for the first time, more unmarried women under thirty had children than married women. (B) those couples that do marry and have children are different from those idealized by policymakers in the 1930s. In 2014, in 60 percent of married couples with children, both parents worked. Few couples, especially if they are parents, can afford to live on one person's earnings. (C) marriage has changed for many, Congress, through the laws it has passed — and refused to pass — has held on firmly to the two ideas that the social insurance system should reward marriage and that marriages should be made up of breadwinners and homemakers.

（Suzanne Kahn, The Next Battle for Marriage Equality, Dissent Magazine 2016. Reprinted with permission of the University of Pennsylvania Press.）

注　Justice 判事（肩書き）　benefit（保険・福利厚生などの）給付金，諸手当
spouse 配偶者　workforce 労働人口
care work（家事・育児・介護などの）ケア労働
Social Security 米国の社会保障制度
breadwinner-homemaker 一家の生計を支える稼ぎ手（大黒柱）―主婦
dependent benefit 扶養手当

問１　下線部（1）を和訳しなさい。

問２　下線部（2）の指す内容を，具体的に 80 字以内の日本語（句読点を含む）で説明しなさい。

問３　下線部（3）の “carrots and sticks” すなわち「飴と鞭」の指す内容を，それぞれ具体的に日本語で説明しなさい。

問４　空欄（ A ），（ B ），（ C ）に入れる語句の組み合わせとして最も適切なものを以下の選択肢①〜⑥から１つ選び，記号で答えなさい。

	（ A ）	（ B ）	（ C ）
①	although	Whereas	While
②	although	Even	As if
③	however	Because	As if
④	however	Because	Unless
⑤	therefore	Whereas	Unless
⑥	therefore	Even	While

背景知識 同性婚について

●同性婚の歴史

・2001年 オランダで世界初めて同性婚が法的に認められる。
・2015年 合衆国連邦最高裁判所が同性婚を全州で合法にすることを認める判決を下し，アメリカで合法化。

●同性婚の賛成派の意見

・差別の防止・人権擁護
同性婚が法的に認められれば，差別的発言が減少し，LGBTの人たちの人権擁護につながる。
・遺産相続・福利厚生
法的に婚姻関係が認められれば，配偶者への遺産を相続できる。所得税などの配偶者控除や介護休暇などの福利厚生を受けられる。

●同性婚の反対派の意見

・人口減少に繋がる
現代の少子高齢化社会が，ますます増進されてしまう。
・伝統的な結婚制度が破壊される
伝統を重んじる人間たちは，男性・女性で従来結ばれてきた婚姻関係が，同性婚で壊されると批判する。

高3 トップレベル英語 リーディング＜長文演習編＞
第８講　解答

解答

問１　一見すると，政府や雇用者が結婚したカップルに提供する物質的利益は，それぞれの夫婦を「養う」ためにあるというケネディの主張は，何か明白なことを理想論的に言い換えているだけのように思える。

問２　結婚しているカップルに出る給付金は，夫婦の一方が外に出て働き，他方が家で金にならないケア労働をするというライフスタイルを奨励している。（67字）

問３　一方が外に出て働き，他方が家事を引き受ける夫婦には，アメリカの社会保障制度は退職時に扶養手当という「あめ」を与えるが，独身者や共働き夫婦は扶養手当の恩恵はなく，「むち」で打たれるような不利な扱いを受けること。

問４　⑥

問題と選択肢の訳

問４

	（　A　）——	（　B　）——	（　C　）
①	とはいえ	一方	だが一方
②	とはいえ	でさえ	のように
③	しかしながら	なぜなら	のように
④	しかしながら	なぜなら	しないかぎり
⑤	したがって	一方	しないかぎり
⑥	したがって	でさえ	だが一方

本文の全訳

昨年6月に，最高裁判所はアメリカ全土で同性婚を合法化した。アンソニー・ケネディ判事が書いた歴史的判決理由は，とても美しい文言を用いていたので，それはすぐに結婚式で人気となった。9月に，私は，結婚のおかげで，「2人の人間が1人では見つけることのできない人生を見つけることができる，というのは，結婚はただ人間が2人いることよりも偉大なものとなるからだ」というケネディの宣言を引用した3つの結婚式に出席した。

引用数はより少ないが，おそらくより重要なのは，ケネディの判決理由のうち，かつては結婚する権利を否定されていた同性カップルに課された「物質的な負担」を挙げた部分だ。例えば，退職貯蓄制度，健康保険，そして税務政策の適用から，労働者とその配偶者に与えられる給付金や報酬は除外されていた。「結婚は，国家共同体の基本要素であり続ける」とケネディは説明した。「ちょうどカップルが互いに支え合う誓いをするように，社会もそのカップルを支えることを誓い，2 人の結婚を守り養うために，象徴的な認識と物質的な利益を提供するものだ。」

一見すると，政府や雇用主が結婚したカップルに提供する物質的利益は，それぞれの結婚を「養う」ためにあるというケネディの主張は，「アメリカ人は，結婚には経済的報酬があることを知っている」という何か明らかなことを理想論的に言い換えているだけのように思える。しかしケネディの言葉の選択は適当なものではなかった。「養う」ように設計された給付は，結婚するという行為に報いる以上の役割を果たしている。それらは，結婚したカップルに特定の方法で行動することを促している。その導入以来，アメリカの最大の社会保障制度は，一方の配偶者は外に出て働き，他方の配偶者は家庭で無給のケア労働を行うように，カップルが彼らの家庭経済を構成することを後押しすることで，結婚に不平等を促進してきた。

例えば，社会保障は飴と鞭の両方を使って，大黒柱と主婦からなる結婚を推奨する。ほとんどの人は，社会保障は各人が自分の在職中に制度に払うものだけに基づいて，退職時の給付金を支払うものだと理解している。だが実際には，社会保障は，同じ金額を払った人に対して，平等に支払うわけではない。結婚しているか未婚であるかによっても，個人の給付金額は左右される。社会保障の退職保険制度は，結婚している人に，その人が獲得した全退職給付の 50%をさらに提供する。この「扶養手当」は，労働者の配偶者を支えることを意図している。労働者である独身者は，結婚している人と同じ額の社会保障税を支払うが，この扶養手当を受け取れない。すなわち，独身者は，結婚した人が受け取る額の 3 分の 2 しか受け取れない。

しかしながら，結婚はそのような良い取引であるだけではない。特定の既婚者だけが，社会保障の給付構造から利益を得るのだ。それは，大黒柱と主婦のモデルに全般的に合致するカップルだけなのだ。夫婦が労働力としてほぼ同額を稼ぐ場合，損をする。一方の配偶者は雇用され，他方は雇用されていない場合，家にずっといる配偶者は制度に 1 セントも払わずに，自分の配偶者を通じて扶養手当を受け取る。両方の配偶者が働く場合，扶養手当を受け取ることができるが，それを請求できるのは片方の配偶者だけだ。しかしながら，扶養手当を受け取るためには，「扶養されている」配偶者は，自分自身の所得記録を通じて手にしたすべての社会保障給付を放棄しなければならない。配偶者の稼ぎに十分大きな開きがある場合は，この選択は理にかなっている。収入の高い夫の給付金の 50%という額は，多くの女性が手にする一人一人の

給付よりも大きなものとなるだろう。しかしこの判断では，いまだに，自分が受け取る給付には何の影響もないのに，その制度にお金を支払ってきた女性たちが取り残される。あるいは両方の配偶者が個々に給付金を請求する場合は，結婚していることにより与えられた権利である扶養手当をあきらめることになる。これは共働きの夫婦に対する，社会保障の罰則のようなものだ。共働き夫婦は，その資格のあるすべての給付金を受け取ることはできないのだ。したがって，今日に至るまで，社会保障は，一方の配偶者が家庭にいる結婚に報いている。

今日では，社会保障制度が報いている大黒柱と主婦からなるモデルに従っている家庭は，ますます減少している。社会保障制度が創設された 1930 年代以降，離婚率は上昇し，結婚率は低下した。一方で，2014 年に，25 歳以上の成人で，5 人に 1 人が一度も結婚経験がない。それは，10 人に 1 人であった 1960 年とは対照的だ。また 2012 年には初めて，30 歳未満の子供がいる未婚女性の数が，子供がいる既婚女性の数を上回った。実際に結婚して子供がいるカップルでさえ，1930 年代の政策立案者が理想としたカップルとは異なっている。2014 年には，結婚して，子供のいる夫婦の 60%が共働きであった。片方の者の稼ぎだけで生計を立てていけるカップルで，特に子供がいる場合は，ほとんどいない。多くの人にとって結婚は変わったが，議会は可決した法律や否決した法律を通じて，社会保障制度は結婚に報いるべきで，しかもその結婚は大黒柱と主婦とで構成すべきであるという 2 つの考えをかたく保持している。

第８講 重要語彙リスト

＊一つ一つ何度も繰り返して，
覚えてください

1	the Supreme Court	最高裁判所
2	same-sex	同性同士の
3	historic	歴史上重要な
4	Justice	判事
5	quote	～を引用する
6	declaration	宣言
7	burden	負担
8	exclusion	除外
9	benefit	給付金
10	reward	報酬
11	spouse	配偶者
12	savings	貯蓄
13	tax policy	租税政策
14	building block	基礎的要素
15	vow	～を誓う
16	pledge	～を誓約する
17	symbolic	象徴的な
18	recognition	認識
19	protect	～を保護する
20	nourish	～を養う
21	union	連帯，結婚
22	idealistic	理想主義の
23	random	でたらめの
24	workforce	労働人口
25	care work	（家事・育児・介護などの）ケア労働
26	Social Security	（米国の）社会保障制度
27	breadwinner	大黒柱
28	homemaker	専業主婦（主夫）
29	carrots and sticks	飴と鞭
30	pay out	～を支払う
31	contribute	～を献金する
32	determine	～を決定する
33	dependent	扶養家族
34	deal	取引
35	gain	利益を得る
36	roughly	大雑把に
37	entitle	～に権利を与える
38	conform to	～に従う
39	in contrast to	～と対照的に
40	idealize	～を理想的なものとみなす

第８講 音読用白文 ①②③④⑤⑥⑦⑧⑨⑩

Last June, the Supreme Court made same-sex marriage legal throughout the United States. The historic opinion, written by Justice Anthony Kennedy, used language so beautiful that it quickly became popular in wedding ceremonies. In September, I attended three that quoted Kennedy's declaration that marriage "allows two people to find a life that could not be found alone, for a marriage becomes greater than just the two persons."

Less often quoted, but perhaps more important, is the section of Kennedy's opinion which lists the "material burdens" placed on same-sex couples previously denied the right to marry: exclusion from the benefits and rewards given to workers and their spouses through retirement savings programs, health insurance, and tax policy, for example. "Marriage remains a building block of our national community," Kennedy explained. "Just as a couple vows to support each other, so does society pledge to support the couple, offering symbolic recognition and material benefits to protect and nourish the union."

At first glance, Kennedy's claim that the material benefits offered to married couples by the government and employers are there to "nourish" each union seems like nothing more than an idealistic way of saying something obvious: Americans know that there are economic rewards to marriage. But Kennedy's word choice was not random. Benefits designed to "nourish" do more than reward the act of getting married; they encourage married couples to behave in certain ways. Since their introduction, America's biggest social insurance programs have promoted inequality within marriages by pushing couples to organize their household economies so that one spouse is in the workforce while the other performs unpaid care work in the home.

Social Security, for example, encourages breadwinner-homemaker marriages using both carrots and sticks. Most people understand Social Security to pay out benefits at retirement purely on the basis of what individuals pay into the system during their working lives. But, in fact, Social Security does not pay everyone who contributes the same amount equally. Being married or unmarried also determines the size of an individual's benefit. Social Security's retirement insurance program offers a

married person an extra 50 percent of whatever retirement benefit he or she earns. This "dependent benefit" is intended to support the worker's spouse. Single people in the workforce pay the same Social Security taxes as married people, but they do not earn this dependent benefit. In other words, single people only earn two-thirds of what married people can earn.

However, marriage isn't always such a good deal. Only certain married people gain from Social Security's benefit structure: married couples who generally fit the breadwinner-homemaker model. When spouses earn roughly equal amounts in the workforce, they lose. In a marriage where one spouse is employed and the other is not, the spouse who remains at home receives the dependent benefit — through his/her spouse — without paying anything into the system at all. When both spouses are in the workforce, the dependent benefit is still available, but only one spouse can claim it. To receive the dependent benefit, however, the "dependent" spouse has to give up any Social Security benefits she has earned through her own earnings record. If there is a large enough gap between spouses' earnings, this choice makes sense: 50 percent of the higher-earning husband's benefit will amount to more than the individual benefit earned by many women. But this decision still leaves women having paid money into the system that has no effect on the benefits they receive. Alternatively, if both spouses apply for their individual benefits, they give up the dependent benefit their marriage entitles them to. This is like a Social Security penalty for spouses who both work. Such spouses do not receive the full benefits to which they are entitled. To this day, therefore, Social Security rewards marriages where one spouse stays home.

Today, fewer and fewer families conform to the breadwinner-homemaker model that the social insurance system rewards. Since the 1930s, when the Social Security system was created, divorce rates have risen and marriage rates have fallen. Meanwhile, in 2014, one in five adults over twenty-five had never been married — in contrast to 1960, when it was roughly one in ten. And in 2012, for the first time, more unmarried women under thirty had children than married women. Even those couples that do marry and have children are different from those idealized by policymakers in the 1930s. In 2014, in 60 percent of married couples with children, both parents worked. Few couples, especially if they are parents, can afford to

live on one person’s earnings. While marriage has changed for many, Congress, through the laws it has passed — and refused to pass — has held on firmly to the two ideas that the social insurance system should reward marriage and that marriages should be made up of breadwinners and homemakers.